



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

NT

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/604,449 06/27/00 LUKENBACH

E JBP-508

EXAMINER

IM52/1001

AUDLEY A CIAMFORCERO JR
ONE JOHNSON & JOHNSON PLAZA
NEW BRUNSWICK NJ 08933-7003

HARDEE, J	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER

1751
DATE MAILED:

6
10/01/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/604,449

Applicant(s)

Lukenbach et al.

Examiner

John R. Hardee

Art Unit

1751

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-49 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above, claim(s) 9, 10, 13-21, and 31-43 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 2, 4-8, 11, 12, 22-27, 29, 30, 44, and 46-49 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 3, 28 and 45, elected invention only is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

- 15) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 18) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 16) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 19) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 17) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____ 20) ☐ Other: _____

Art Unit: 1751

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restriction

1. Applicant's election with traverse of Group I, hexylene glycol as the water dispersible component and pentaerythritol tetraoctanoate in Paper No. 5 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that the examiner has not demonstrated that the search of additional inventions would impose a serious burden. This is not found persuasive because the search of 5 independent or distinct inventions is a serious burden on its face. Similarly, searches of large genres of patentably distinct water dispersible components and esters is burdensome, all the more so because applicant's claims are written in such a way that the search of any one invention will require the search of a plethora of auxiliary ingredients (claims 22+).

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

Claims 9, 10, 13-21 and 31-43 are withdrawn from consideration as being drawn to non-elected inventions. The remaining claims were searched and examined only to the extent that they read on the elected invention.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. 28,45

Art Unit: 1751

3. Claims 47 and 48 provide for the use of a composition, but, since the claim does not set forth any steps involved in the method/process, it is unclear what method/process applicant is intending to encompass. A claim is indefinite where it merely recites a use without any active, positive steps delimiting how this use is actually practiced.

Claims 47 and 48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed recitation of a use, without setting forth any steps involved in the process, results in an improper definition of a process, i.e., results in a claim which is not a proper process claim under 35 U.S.C. 101. See for example *Ex parte Dunki*, 153 USPQ 678 (Bd.App. 1967) and *Clinical Products, Ltd. v. Brenner*, 255 F. Supp. 131, 149 USPQ 475 (D.D.C. 1966).

Claim 48 is additionally indefinite because it is a composition claim which depends from what appears to be a method claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

Art Unit: 1751

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103© and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

6. Claims 1, 2, 4-8, 11, 12, 22-27, 29, 30, 44, and 46-49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shah et al., US 4,980,155. The reference discloses two-phase cosmetic compositions comprising a color phase and a gel phase. An essential component of the color phase is a film forming agent at 1-30% of the composition. Preferred film forming agents include pentaerythritol tetraoctanoate (col. 3, lines 25-43). Another essential component of the color phase is an emulsifier. A particularly preferred emulsifier is a blend of triethanolamine and stearic acid (col. 3, lines 44-53). The emulsifier is present at 1-10% by weight of the color forming composition. The examiner notes that when these ingredients are blended in the presence of water, the product is triethanolammonium stearate, which is a soap and a foaming anionic surfactant. Another essential component is water at about 10-98% of the compositions (col. 3,

55, 56 59-60 63-64

Art Unit: 1751

lines 61-62). The compositions may include humectants at 10-30% of the composition. Hexylene glycol is a preferred humectant (col. 5, lines 20-22). Additional optional components include polyethylene glycol stearates (col. 6, lines 9-10). The examiner takes the position that this bears a genus-species relationship with polyethylene glycol-30 dipolyhydroxystearate, as recited in claim 23. Addition of carbomers is disclosed at col. 5, lines 62+. Addition of hydrolyzed silk is disclosed at col. 7, lines 48-49. Method claim 44 is drawn to the intended use of a cosmetic composition and is obvious in view of the disclosure. This reference differs from the claimed subject matter in that it does not disclose a composition which reads on applicant's claims with sufficient specificity to constitute anticipation.

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to make such a composition, because this reference teaches that all of the ingredients recited by applicants are suitable for inclusion in a cosmetic composition. The person of ordinary skill in the surfactant art would expect the recited compositions to have properties similar to those compositions which are exemplified, absent a showing to the contrary.

In the case where the claimed ranges overlap or lie inside ranges disclosed by the prior art, a *prima facie* case of obviousness exists. *In re Wertheim*, 541 F.2d 257, 191 USPQ 90 (CCPA 1976); *In re Woodruff*, 919 F.2d 1575, 16 USPQ2d 1934 (Fed Cir. 1990).

Art Unit: 1751

Allowable Subject Matter

7. Claims 3, 28 and 45 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims, and provided all non-elected subject matter is deleted from the claims.
8. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: The closest prior art of record is Shah et al., US 4,980,155, as summarized above. The reference does not disclose or motivate the inclusion of a silicone, the surfactants of claim 28 or the surfactants of claim 45.
9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is of interest and is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.
10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to the examiner, Dr. John R. Hardee, whose telephone number is (703) 305-5599. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:00 until 4:30. In the event that the examiner is not available, his supervisor, Dr. Yogendra Gupta, may be reached at (703) 308-4708.

Art Unit: 1751

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0661.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "J. Hardee", with a stylized flourish at the end.

John R. Hardee

Primary Examiner

September 27, 2001